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Reviewer’s report:

The work underlying this manuscript was clearly substantial. I believe, the importance of this
work however, is currently understated. The author might like to consider clarifying the
implications of the findings. Specific comments below.

Clarify the purpose of the paper (this is a minor comment, as likely due to typo). It would help
the reader if the text were consistent throughout regarding the study aim: comparison between
2010 and 2013 vs. 2013 status quo.

Point the reader to the aids, which help define the different types of claims. This area of nutrition
can be confusing. Utilise your tables and your figure, so that a reader can easily refer to a picture
or a text example of each claim.

Clarify what policy/guidelines might have changed (introduced or discontinued), when, by
whom and why between 2010 and 2013. This might help with introducing why there has been a
focus on gluten free claims and also, more widely, when considering the implications of your
findings.

Suggest schedule M is referenced in a self-explanatory way, to aid non-Canadian readers.

Methods. Ensure sufficient information is provided to understand the datasets collected or why
certain procedures were carried out. Consider including a table/detail of the in/exclusion criteria
and/or reflect upon this in your limitations. Consider explaining the significance of the Atwater
calculations and the brand review.

Stats. Consider reporting the chi square statistic and degrees of freedom, alongside the
significance values. An indication of the effect size in terms of odds ratios might not be
necessary; however, it would allow the reader to understand if any of the differences observed
were meaningful differences.

Reflect on the findings and limitations of the paper. What might you have missed by not
surveying 25% of the market share? Was it interesting that certain products did not have a
nutrient profile that corresponded to the label? How does the decision tree developed here differ
from/better those used in previous studies? Why would a food be considered of public health
priority and who might decide/drive this: policy priority, consumer demand, health outcome
driven etc.? What questions could be answered if these data were combined with sales data? The reasons why DRRC might not have increased over three years or the significance of this result.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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